REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar. The amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into a substitute specification and abstract. Attached are two versions of the substitute specification and abstract, a marked-up version showing the revisions, as well as a clean version. No new matter has been added.

II. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-12 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, claims 13-15 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the reference relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

It is also noted that claims 13-15 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the

Doctrine of Equivalents.

III. Claim Objections

Claims 13-15 were objected in view of various informalities identified on page 2 of the Office Action. Withdrawal of these objections is requested, since claims 13-15 have been amended to resolve the problems identified by the Examiner.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failing to point out which statutory class the claimed subject matter belongs to. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claim 13 is directed to a _method_ of operating a communication system. The communication system is a complex system, such that the structure of the components of the system _must_ be identified in order to recite the limitations (steps) of the method. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is, in fact, directed toward a method including various steps for operating the communication system.

Additionally, Applicants note that the language/structure of claim 13 has been slightly amended to more clearly identify that claim 13 is directed to a method and also note the method steps have been amended to clarify the specific limitations of the method of operating the communications system.

Thus, for the reasons identified above, withdrawal of this 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is respectfully requested.

V. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for failing to point out which statutory class the claimed subject matter belongs to, and for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As discussed above in section IV, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 13-15 do point out which statutory class the claimed subject matter belongs to. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 13-15 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

VI. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kenichi et al. (U.S. JP 2002-215826). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended claims 13-15 for the following reasons.

Independent claim 13 recites a method of operating a communication system comprising an Nth authentication apparatus, an (N+1)th authentication apparatus, and an (N+1)th download server. Further, claim 13 recites starting up the Nth authentication apparatus to place the Nth authentication apparatus in operation to issue a Nth server certificate ensuring validity of an application server. In addition, claim 13 recites (1) issuing, via an Nth CA information issue unit of the Nth authentication apparatus, Nth CA information including an Nth CA certificate indicating that the Nth server certificate is valid and an (N+1)th address for update indicating a

8

location of the (N+1)th download server on the communication network. Claim 13 also recites that (2) after the starting up of the operation of the Nth authentication apparatus, starting up the (N+1)th authentication apparatus and the (N+1)th download server to place the (N+1)th authentication apparatus and the (N+1)th download server into operation (the starting up of the (N+1)th authentication apparatus and the (N+1)th download server taking place before a validity period of the Nth CA certificate expires). Finally, claim 3 recites (3) terminating the operation of the (N+1)th download server after the validity period of the Nth CA certificate expires. Kenichi fails to disclose or suggest above-mentioned distinguishing features (1)-(3), as recited in amended independent claim 13.

Rather, Kenichi teaches that information is recorded on the certificate 101 by the certificate authority 400, wherein the information recorded includes (i) an end date of a term of validity 401 of the certificate 101, and (ii) certificate authority address information 402 (i.e., the address of the certificate authority that recorded the information into the certificate) (see paragraph [0011]). Furthermore, Kenichi teaches that the "*certificate automatic-updating device can update a certificate automatically before the certificate expires*" (as explained on page 6 of the present Office Action citing paragraphs [0005], [0007], [0011], [0012] and [0014]-[0020] and Figs. 4-9 of Kenichi). Moreover, Kenichi teaches that once automatic updating is performed, the updated certificate is stored and the user is asked whether or not the previous certificate should be deleted (see paragraph [0018]).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Kenichi teaches that the certificate includes an end data of a term of validity and an address of the certificate authority that recorded the information into the certificate, but fails to disclose or suggest issuing Nth CA information that

9

includes an <u>Nth CA certificate indicating that the Nth server certificate is valid</u> and includes an

<u>(N+1)th address for update indicating a location of the (N+1)th download server</u> on the

communication network, as required by claim 13.

In other words, Kenichi's disclosure that the certificate identifies <u>a time at which validity</u>

<u>of the certificate ends</u> and <u>an address of a certificate authority</u> that recorded the information into

the certificate is not a disclosure or suggestion of issuing information that includes (i) an <u>Nth CA</u>

<u>certificate indicating that the Nth server certificate is valid</u> and (ii) an <u>(N+1)th address for update</u>

<u>indicating a location of the (N+1)th download server</u> on the communication network, as required

by claim 13.

Additionally, it is noted that Kenichi teaches that certificate automatic-updating device

can update a certificate automatically before the certificate expires, but still fails to disclose or

suggest the sequencing required by claims 13 (i.e., that <u>after</u> starting up of the operation of the

Nth authentication apparatus, <u>starting</u> up the (N+1)th authentication apparatus and the (N+1)th

download server <u>before</u> a validity period of the Nth CA certificate expires).

Moreover, it is evident that Kenichi merely teaches that the updated certificate is stored

and the user is asked whether or not the previous certificate should be <u>deleted</u>, but fails to

disclose or suggest <u>terminating the operation</u> of the (N+1)th download server <u>after</u> the validity

period of the Nth CA certificate expires, as recited in claim 13.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that

independent claim 13 and claims 14 and 15 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by

Kenichi.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Kenichi or elsewhere in the prior art

of record that would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kenichi to obtain

the invention of independent claim 13. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that

independent claim 13 and claims 14 and 15 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the

prior art of record.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application

is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The

Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Junji YOSHIDA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/
By: 2008.12.23 12:57:46 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 23, 2008